

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

RONALD COLLINS,)	3:13-cv-00255-RCJ-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
vs.)	
)	December 18, 2015
NDOC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is Plaintiff’s “Motion for Order Ordering Defendants Counsel to Provide Plaintiff With Names of Defendants That are no Longer Employed With the NDOC and the Reasons Why.” (ECF No. 200.) Defendants have responded (ECF No. 204) and Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 205.)

Plaintiff's motion notes that a certain filing of Defendants (ECF No. 193 at 25-26) suggests one or more of the defendants is no longer employed by the Nevada Department of Corrections (NDOC). Plaintiff does not suggest how the employment, or cessation of employment of any of the defendants, may be relevant to any of the issues in this case. Defendants contend that any evidence of employment would not be admissible in any event (citing Fed. R. Evid. 404(b) "prior bad acts are inadmissible character evidence"). (ECF No. 204 at 1.) Nevertheless, rather than make an issue of it, counsel referenced that other than Warden LeGrand's retirement from NDOC, all other Defendants remain employed by that agency. (*Id.*, at 2.)

Despite this representation of counsel, Plaintiff insists he is “under the impression now that other Defendants are no longer employed at LCC NDOC.” (ECF No. 205 at 2.) Plaintiff seems to expand the scope of his original motion by now asking whether the Defendants, even if they are still employed by NDOC, are still assigned to Lovelock Correctional Center.

Regardless of the location of employment, the relevancy of which is questionable (particularly at this stage where discovery has long since closed (ECF No. 90)), the Defendants have provided the information Plaintiff sought in his motion. (ECF No. 204 at 2.)

Plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 200) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk